

1 ELYSE D. ECHTMAN (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
2 eechtman@orrick.com  
3 ORRICK, HERRINGTON & SUTCLIFFE LLP  
4 51 West 52<sup>nd</sup> Street  
5 New York, New York 10019  
6 Telephone: (212) 506-5000  
7 Facsimile: (212) 506-5151

5 CHRISTINA GUEROLA SARCHIO (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
6 csarchio@orrick.com  
7 ORRICK, HERRINGTON & SUTCLIFFE LLP  
8 1152 15<sup>th</sup> Street, N.W.  
9 Washington, D.C. 20005  
10 Telephone: (202) 339-8400  
11 Facsimile: (202) 339-8500

12 KATIE LIEBERG STOWE (STATE BAR NO. 257206)  
13 kstowe@orrick.com  
14 ORRICK, HERRINGTON & SUTCLIFFE LLP  
15 The Orrick Building  
16 405 Howard Street  
17 San Francisco, California 94105  
18 Telephone: (415) 773-5700  
19 Facsimile: (415) 773-5759

20 Attorneys for Defendants  
21 Talkatone, Inc., Talkatone, LLC, and Ooma, Inc.

22  
23  
24 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
25 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
26 SAN JOSE DIVISION  
27  
28

19 MICHELLE HERNANDEZ, ASHLEY  
20 SALINAS, JOHN RAMIREZ, and ANDRE  
21 RUFUS, individuals and on behalf of a class of  
similarly situated individuals,

22 Plaintiffs,

23 v.

24 TALKATONE, INC., a Delaware corporation,  
25 TALKATONE, LLC, a Delaware limited  
liability company, OOMA, INC., a Delaware  
corporation, and DOES 1-100, inclusive,

26 Defendants.

27 Case No. 15-cv-03703 PSG  
28

**REQUEST FOR JUDICIAL NOTICE IN  
SUPPORT OF DEFENDANTS'  
MOTION TO DISMISS**

**Hon. Paul S. Grewal**

**Hearing Date:** December 1, 2015  
**Hearing Time:** 10:00 a.m.  
**Courtroom:** 5

Pursuant to Rule 201 of the Federal Rules of Evidence, Defendants Talkatone, Inc.,  
 Talkatone, LLC, and Ooma, Inc. (“Defendants”) request that the Court take judicial notice of the  
 following documents, attached hereto as Exhibits A–E, in connection with Defendants’ Motion to  
 Dismiss Plaintiffs’ Class Action Complaint (the “Complaint”):

<b>Exhibit</b>	<b>Description</b>
<b>A</b>	Fourth Amended Class Action Complaint, <i>McKenna v. WhisperText, LLC</i> , No. 14-CV-00424-PSG (Docket No. 68) (N.D. Cal. Mar. 9, 2015)
<b>B</b>	Talkatone video tutorial: Instagram, Talkatone Video Tutorial, <a href="http://bit.do/tktninvite">http://bit.do/tktninvite</a>
<b>C</b>	Talkatone webpage: Talkatone, <i>Knowledge Base: Invite your Contacts to join Talkatone</i> , <a href="http://support.talkatone.com/customer/en_us/portal/articles/1908072-invite-your-contacts-to-join-talkatone">http://support.talkatone.com/customer/en_us/portal/articles/1908072-invite-your-contacts-to-join-talkatone</a>
<b>D</b>	The Federal Communications Commission’s (“FCC”) 2003 Telephone Consumer Protection Act (“TCPA”) Declaratory Ruling: <i>In the Matter of Rules &amp; Regulations Implementing the Tel. Consumer Protection Act of 1991, Report &amp; Order</i> , CG Docket No. 02-278, 18 F.C.C. Rec’d 14014 (2003)
<b>E</b>	The FCC’s 2015 TCPA Declaratory Ruling & Order: <i>In the Matter of Rules &amp; Regulations Implementing the Tel. Consumer Protection Act of 1991, Declaratory Ruling &amp; Order</i> , CG Docket No. 02-278 (2015)

Judicial notice of the foregoing documents is proper. The Court may judicially notice facts not subject to reasonable dispute because they are (1) generally known within the territorial jurisdiction of the trial court; or (2) capable of accurate and ready determination by resort to sources whose accuracy cannot reasonably be questioned. Fed. R. Evid. 201(b).

Exhibit A cannot be subject to reasonable dispute because it is contained within the files of the Court. *See Reyn’s Pasta Bella, LLC v. Visa USA, Inc.*, 442 F.3d 741, 746 n.6 (9th Cir. 2006) (taking judicial notice of documents from court records).

Exhibits B and C are publically available on the internet, and Plaintiffs reference both the website and video in their complaint. Compl. ¶ 22. Under settled Ninth Circuit law, documents are incorporated by reference into a complaint if their “contents are alleged in a complaint and [their] authenticity no party questions, but which are not physically attached to the [complaint].” *Branch v. Tunnell*, 14 F.3d 449, 454 (9th Cir. 1994). “The court may treat such a document as

1 ‘part of the complaint’” and “may assume that its contents are true for purposes of a motion to  
2 dismiss under Rule 12(b)(6).” *Marder v. Lopez*, 450 F.3d 445, 448 (9th Cir. 1996) (emphases  
3 added).

4 Exhibits D and E are decisions of regulatory agencies and the content of the decisions are  
5 not subject to reasonable dispute. *See Rincon Band of Luiseno Mission Indians of the Rincon*  
6 *Reservation v. Schwarzenegger*, 602 F.3d 1019, 1039–40 (9th Cir. 2010) (taking judicial notice of  
7 the Department of the Interior’s interpretation of the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act).

8  
9 Dated: October 23, 2015

ORRICK, HERRINGTON & SUTCLIFFE LLP  
1152 15<sup>th</sup> Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20005

10  
11 By: /s/ Christina Guerola Sarchio  
12 CHRISTINA GUEROLA SARCHIO  
13 (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
14 Attorneys for Defendants Talkatone, Inc., Talkatone,  
LLC, and Ooma, Inc

15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28